



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,323	09/18/2003	David J. Payne	08049.0933	6243
22852 7590 11/25/2009 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				
EXAMINER JOSEPH, TONYA S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3628				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/25/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/665,323

Applicant(s)

PAYNE ET AL.

Examiner

TONYA JOSEPH

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-13, 16-25, 28-37, 40-48 and 57-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-13, 16-25, 28-37, 40-48 and 57-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/14/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 09/14/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. Applicant argues with respect to the independent claims that the newly added limitation, ... "that contains an error that is correctable to match a predetermined deliverable address format, the incorrect address being associated with a first item..." The Examiner disagrees. All that is recited by the claim amendment is that an item contains an address error that can be corrected to match the predetermined correct address. This limitation has been shown in the prior art of record. Specifically, Anchor receives an incorrect address, that is correctable to match a new address of a customer that has moved. Anchor then resolves the incorrect address to match a predetermined address format (see pg. 2 para. 8).

NCOA match, corrected address is provided		
MAIL FILE	NCOA DATABASE	NEW ADDRESS
Paul Jones 123 Main Street Anytown, CT 06084	Paul Jones 123 Main Street Anytown, CT 06084	Paul Jones 39 Oak Street Anytown, MA 01245
John Smith 481 Elm St, Apt 4A Anytown, CA	John Smith 481 Elm St, Apt 4A Anytown, CA 90241	John Smith 11 Duck Lane Anytown, IL 61411

(8)

The mail file is the incorrect address that contains an error-(the street name, city and state) that is correctable to match the predetermined new address format. If Applicant insists that the address format is not shown, the Examiner notes that an apartment number as opposed in addition to a 3 digit house address as opposed to a 2 digit address are both examples of a predetermined deliverable address format. (see above)

Applicant further argues that Allen does not teach storing a resolved address in a database. The Examiner notes: Allen was not relied upon to teach this limitation, (see the most previous Office Action dated, 05/12/2009). The incorrect address of Allen is an address that is not accurate. The reason for the inaccuracy being, whether or not the recipient has moved, which incidentally may result in an incorrect zip code for the recipient, or because a number in the zip code is different, is irrelevant. In either instance the address is **still incorrect for the purposes of delivery**. Furthermore, Applicant's specification merely describes a type of incorrect address and contrary to Applicant's arguments, fails to define an explicit definition for an incorrect address. The Examiner maintains that Allen does teach an incorrect address consistent with the plain meaning of the term and Applicant's specification.

Accordingly, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and the rejections are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4-13, 16-25, 28-37 and 40-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,422,821 in view of Anchor.

3. As per Claims 1, 13, 25 and 37, Allen teaches receiving a second instance of an incorrect address associated with a second item (see Col. 4 lines 62-68 and Col. 5 lines 1-10, Examiner is interpreting the previously stored instance of the resolved address as a first instance and the current resolution process as the second instance. Examiner is further interpreting a second item as the physical mailpiece); comparing the second instance of the incorrect address to the stored resolved address to determine that the second instance of the incorrect address matches the stored first instance of the incorrect address (see Col. 15 lines 63-68 and Col. 16 lines 1-3); and outputting the correct address from the database based on the determination (see Col. 9 lines 25-30); a storage device containing computer instructions; and a processor, connected to the storage device, that executes the computer instructions to perform operations (see Col. 12 lines 4-12) Allen does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by Anchor receiving a first instance of an incorrect address that contains an error that is correctable to match a

predetermined deliverable address format, the incorrect address being associated with a first item, wherein the incorrect address does not match address information contained in a predetermined address database (see para. 47 and 39); resolving the first instance of the incorrect address to determine a correct address in the predetermined deliverable address format by using at least one of a plurality of address resolution processes (see pg. 2 para. 7), storing a resolved address in a database (see pg. 2 para. 7-8); the resolved address comprising the correct address and the first instance of the incorrect address that contains the error that is correctable to match the predetermined deliverable address format (see pg. 2 para. 7-8). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the method of Allen to include the teachings of Anchor to maintain correct address mailing lists.

4. As per Claims 4, 16, 28 and 40, Allen in view of Anchor teaches the method, medium and system of claims 1, 25 and 37 as described above. Allen further teaches processing the second item for delivery in an item delivery system (see Col. 5 lines 1-10).

5. As per Claims 5, 17, 29 and 41, Allen in view of Anchor teaches the method, medium and system of claims 4, 28 and 40 as described above. Allen further teaches wherein the item delivery system comprises the United States Postal Service (see Col. 5 lines 39-53). Although, Allen discloses a delivery system as set forth above; Examiner notes the recitation; wherein the item delivery system comprises the United

States Postal Service constitutes non-functional descriptive language and as such is afforded little patentable weight.

6. As per Claims 6, 18, 30 and 42, Allen in view of Anchor teaches the method, medium and system of claims 4 and 28 as described above. Allen further teaches wherein the second item comprises at least one of a mailpiece (see Col. 8 lines 19-24).

7. As per Claims 7, 19, 31 and 43, Allen in view of Anchor teaches the method, medium and system of claims 1, 25 and 37 as described above. Allen does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by Anchor wherein at least one of the plurality of address resolution processes includes sending the first item including the first instance of the incorrect address; the first item configured to be delivered in an item delivery system (see pg. 1 para.2), to an element of the item delivery system that delivers in an area defined by a United States Postal Service ZIP code included in the first instance of the incorrect address; and (see pg. 1 para. 2) wherein the method further comprises at least one of verifying, validating or supplying information to be included in the correct address (see pg. 2 para. 8) It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the methods of Allen to further include the teachings of Anchor to maintain and update accurate address mailing lists.

8. As per Claims 8, 20, 32 and 44, Allen in view of Anchor teaches the method, medium and system of claims 1, 25 and 37 as described above. Allen does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by Anchor wherein at least one of the plurality of address resolution processes includes entering first instance of the incorrect address into a database to obtain a correct United States Postal Service ZIP+4 code to be

included in the correct address (see pg. 2 para. 8). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the methods of Allen and Lopez to further include the teachings of Anchor to maintain and update accurate address mailing lists.

9. As per Claims 9, 21, 33 and 45, Allen in view of Anchor teaches the method, medium and system of claims 1, 25 and 37 as described above. Allen does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by Anchor wherein at least one of the plurality of address resolution processes includes modifying individual address components of the first instance of the incorrect address record to obtain a valid match to a database entry (see pg. 2 para. 8 and 10 and pg. 3 para. 5). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the methods of Allen to further include the teachings of Anchor to maintain and update accurate address mailing lists.

10. As per Claims 10, 22, 34 and 46, Allen in view of Anchor teaches the method, medium and system of claims 1, 25 and 37 as described above. Allen further teaches wherein at least one of receiving and outputting further comprises utilizing at least one of regular mail, e-mail, facsimile, internet, or an interactive voice response system (see Col. 4 lines 23-40).

11. As per Claims 11, 23, 35 and 47, Allen in view of Anchor teaches the method, medium and system of claims 1, 25 and 37 as described above. Allen further teaches wherein at least one of receiving and outputting further comprises communicating over

a network (see Col. 4 lines 62-67, Examiner is interpreting a computer retrieval of information in a database as communication over a network).

12. As per Claims 12, 24, 36 and 48, Allen in view of Anchor teaches the methods as described above. Allen further teaches wherein the second instance of the incorrect address includes an incorrect United States Postal Service ZIP+4 code (see Col. 4 lines 23-26 and 30-36).

13. Claims 57-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,422,821 in view of Lopez et al. U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0029202 A1 in further view of Anchor.

14. As per Claims 57, 60 and 63, Allen in view of Anchor teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Allen does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by Lopez, processing the first item for delivery in an item delivery system using the correct address (see para. 46). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the methods of Allen and Anchor to further include the teachings of Lopez to forward mail to a correct address.

15. As per Claims 58, 61 and 64, Allen in view of Anchor teaches the methods as described above. Allen does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by Lopez, wherein the first item comprises one of a letter and a package (see para. 46). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the methods of Allen and Anchor to further include the teachings of Lopez to enhance the functionality of a mailpiece carrier.

16. As per Claims 59 and 62, Allen in view of Anchor teaches the methods of as described above. Allen does not explicitly teach the limitation taught by Lopez, obtaining the first instance of the incorrect address from the surface of the first item (see para. 11). It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the methods of Allen and Anchor to further include the teachings of Lopez to capture address data from a mailpiece.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TONYA JOSEPH whose telephone number is (571)270-1361. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 7:30 am-5:00pm First Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571 272 0847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JOHN W HAYES/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628